

single similar specimen in the Madras Museum, does not name the place where it was found. It might have been sent from Ganjam, or indeed from any Telugu speaking district. One of the present coins has on the obverse letters which look like Telugu. From these considerations I am inclined to infer that the kings who struck these medals ruled over Telingana, and probably Orissa. Could they have been the Orissa kings of the Suryavañśa dynasty (1434–1538?), who were contemporaneous with the 2nd line of Vijayanagar kings, who were powerful enough to conquer the districts of Kistna and Godavery, and who appear from their inscriptions to have been Vaishnavas by religion? I should not be surprised if further researches establish this view.

Since the above was written, I have come across another specimen. It has a diameter of $1\frac{3}{16}$ inches and a thickness of $\frac{1}{32}$ nearly. Its weight is 217 grains.

This weight is unique. The five specimens above described are either 3 or 4 times of 65 or 66 grains, the usual weight of a Máṛha.* But this weight (217 grains) cannot be so classified.

The following is a detailed description of this new specimen.

Obverse.—This is divided into two parts by a line with dots under.

The upper part contains Ráma seated on a throne, and to his right Sítá, both facing towards the left. Ráma has in one hand a bow and in the other hand (raised) an arrow. Below, and to the left, are Hanumán holding Ráma's foot, and Jámbuván standing. Below, and to the right, is Bharat holding an umbrella. Under the throne is conch shell.

The lower part has some undecipherable indistinct figures.

Reverse.—Five human figures standing with chámars in their hands.

The outlines are very indistinct.

Note on the topography of the river in the 16th century from Húglí to the Sea as represented in the Da Asia of De Barros.—By C. R. WILSON, M. A.

(With one plate.)

The topography of the Húglí has been very ably discussed by Blochmann and Yule, and I do not propose in the present paper to re-open the general discussion. I wish to limit my observations to the course of the river as represented in the *Da Asia* of the Portuguese historian De Barros. The first decad of this work was originally printed in 1552, the second in 1553, the third in 1563, the fourth decad, as completed by Lavanha, appeared in 1613. It is in the fourth decad that we find the *De-*

* For Máṛha see my essay on the Currency of Orissa, published in the Journ. As. Soc. Beng. Vol. LXI, No. I, p. 45.

scripcao do Reino de Bengalla. The map suggests two or three topographical questions which it will be well to keep distinct as far as possible. (1) What is the meaning of the map as it stands? (2) How far is it the original work of De Barros? (3) How far can it be trusted as accurate? I shall try to deal with these questions so far as they are concerned with the course of the river from Húglí to the sea.

I. The map does not contain the name "Húglí" at all. The river is called the Ganges; and, instead of the town Húglí, we have Sátgáon standing on the Sarasvatí, close to the junction of that river with the Ganges and the Jamuná. Below Sátgáon come Agarpára, Xore (which Blochmann identifies as Dakhinshor), and Baránagar. Then comes the town of Betor. It is here that I take up the question of the interpretation of the map. Blochmann* says: "Belor has not yet been identified, unless it is intended for the insignificant village of Belur, opposite to Chitpur, with which it agrees in position." It appears that Blochmann read Belor instead of Betor, although the *t* is quite clear in the map: hence perhaps the difficulty, for Betor is mentioned several times by writers in the 16th century, and was certainly not an insignificant village. The Bengali poets, Mukundaráma Chakravartí and Mádhava Achárya, each wrote a Lay of Chaṇḍí, and they both speak of Betor † It was a sanctuary of the goddess Chaṇḍí, and also a good riverside market to stop at to buy provisions. Cæsar Frederick thus describes the place. "A good tide's rowing before you come to Satagan you shall have a place which is called Buttor, and from thence upwards the ships do not go because that upwards the river is very shallow, and

* *Geographical and Historical Notes on the Burdwan and Presidency Divisions*, at the end of *Hunter's Statistical Account of the 24 Paryanáas*.

† For instance in the ordinary printed editions of the Chaṇḍí Maṅgal we read:—

त्तराय चल्लिल तरौ तिलेक ना रय ।

चितपुर सालिखा एड़ाइया याय ॥

कलिकाता एड़ाइल वेणियार बाला ।

वेतड़ेते उत्तरिल अवसान बेला ॥

वेताइ चण्डिका पूजा कैल सावधाने ।

धनसु ग्रामखाना साधु एड़ाइल वामे ॥

डाहिने एड़ाइया याय हिजलिर पथ ।

राजहंस किनिया लइल पारावत ॥

Similarly Mádhava Achárya says:—

रैघरे थाकिया साधु बले वाहवा ।

वेतालेते उत्तरिल साधुर सप्रना ॥

little water. Every year at Buttor they make and unmake a village with houses and shops made of straw, and with all things necessary to their uses, and this village standeth as long as the ships ride there, and till they depart for the Indies, [*i. e.*, Goa] and when they are departed every man goeth to his plot of houses, and there setteth fire on them, which thing made me to marvel. For as I passed up to Satagan, I saw this village standing with a great number of people, with an infinite number of ships and bazars, and at my return coming down with my Captain of the last ship, for whom I tarried, I was all amazed to see such a place so soon razed and burnt, nothing left but the sign of the burnt houses. The small ships go to Satagan and there they lade.”

Where then was this Betor which it would seem was in 1565 second only to Sátgáon in importance? (a) According to Cæsar Frederick, it was a good tide's rowing from Sátgáon. (b) According to De Barros' map, as interpreted by Blochmann, Betor is somewhere opposite Chitpur. (c) The ordinary printed versions of Mukundaráma's Chaṇḍí give us the following sequence of villages—Chitpur, Sálíkhá, Kalikátá, Betaṛ. There can be no doubt then that this Betor, the original nursery of the trade which was afterwards transplanted to Calcutta, is the Betor which lies to the west and south of the modern Sibpur, which is even now revered as an old sanctuary of the goddess Chaṇḍí.

This identification of Betor leads to many interesting reflections.

(a) Calcutta, or what is practically the same Betor, is the oldest seat of European trade in Bengal, its importance being due to the fact that above Betor the river became much shallower, and consequently the Portuguese when they first came to Bengal were unwilling to trust their ships higher up the river.

(b) From the coming of the Portuguese in 1530, to their establishment at Húglí in about 1570, Garden Reach was annually crowded with Portuguese shipping, and even after 1570 it still remained a favourite reach to anchor in, as Mr. T. R. Munro has recently told us.

(c) It is this early importance of the place which explains why the Setts and Bysacks came and colonised Govindpur and opened Sútánuṭi Háṭ, which again led Job Charnock to select Calcutta as the site of the English settlement.

(d) Critics are wrong when they argue that the main stream of the river flowed down Tolly's Nulla, or the Ádi-Gaṅgá, as late as the 16th century, because in the Chaṇḍí Maṅgal the voyagers go this way. The native boatmen avoided the present course of the river to Hijili, not because it was too shallow, but because it was too deep: so deep as to be readily accessible to the galliasses of the Arracauese pirates, whom the voyagers were most anxious to escape.

Between Betor and the sea De Barros gives the following topographical details. On the west side the Dámodar* enters the Ganges by three mouths forming two islands, and lower down the river Ganga just before its junction with the Ganges bifurcates and encloses a small delta; between the Ganga and the Dámodar are Pisolta and Pisacoly. On the east side there are two tributaries answering approximately to the northern mouths of the Dámodar and the Ganga, and between these two tributaries lies Pacuculij. Pisolta is just above the point where the Ganga joins the Ganges, and in the first chapter of the ninth book of the first decad of the *Da Asia* we read that the “Ganga discharges into the illustrious stream of the Ganges between the two places called Angeli and Picholda in about 22 degrees.” The Ganges and the Ganga are respectively the Húglí and the Rúpnráyan,† Angeli is Hijili, the coast land from the mouth of the Rúpnráyan to near Jaleswar, and hence it becomes pretty clear that Picholda, which is wrongly spelt Pisolta in the map, is the same place as Pichuldoho, a small village and market on the north of the Rúpnráyan, close to Fort Mornington Point.‡

II. Having thus identified Betor and Picholda, it will be necessary for me, before going further, to deal with my second point, and consider, how far the map is the original work of De Barros, and how far it has been prepared by subsequent and inferior hands. And this is the more important because I think that De Barros was a much better informed authority than the writers who came after him, and who seem to borrow from De Barros often without understanding him. For instance Faria de Sousa, finding in the *Da Asia* the statement about the Ganga, which

* The name is not given in the map, but there can be no doubt as to the identity of the river.

† The Ganga is the Rúpnráyan. Sir Henry Yule says, “It is the Ganga of A. Hamilton; and is marked as “The Ganges” in Warren and Wood’s Survey which appears in the *Pilot* of 1748, names arising from some old confusion not easily explained. It is now known as the Rupnarain” (see *Hedges’ Diary*, Vol. III, p. ccx.)

‡ Since I wrote the above, Pandit Haraprasád Sástri has pointed out to me that Pichhaldá is mentioned more than once in the *Chaitanya Charitá*. In Book II, Chapter 16, we read :—

मद्यप यवन राजार आगे अधिकार ।
तार भये पथे केह नारे चलिवार ॥
पिक्कलदा पर्यन्त सब तार अधिकार ।
तार भये नदी केह हैते नारे पार ॥

And again :—

मन्तेश्वर दुष्ट नदे पार कराइल ।
पिक्कलदा पर्यन्त सेइ यवन आइल ॥

I have just quoted, reproduces it in the following fashion:—"The *Ganges* falls into the *sea* between the *cities* of *Arigola* and *Pisalta* in about latitude 22° ." In the same way, an inferior hand seems to have been employed in the preparation of the *Descripcao do Reino de Bengalla*, for which De Barros had probably left only rough drawings. It was not De Barros, I imagine, who put Baránagar on the wrong side of the river, or mis-spelt Picholda, or left out the name of Hijili altogether; it was not De Barros who inserted the existing erroneous degrees of latitude and fallacious scale of leagues; it was not De Barros who congregated together in one map a number of heterogeneous plans of Bengal without any attempt to make their measurements uniform. For, if we take the trouble to make a slight calculation, we shall find that the ostensible scale of the map is certainly not the scale of that portion which represents the course of the river from Betor to the sea, the portion which must have been best known to De Barros. The distance between the 22nd and 23rd degrees of latitude as given in the plan is $\frac{7}{6}$ in. Hence 68 miles = $\frac{7}{6}$ in., or 1 in. = $58\frac{2}{7}$ miles; and this is no doubt the measure indicated by the accompanying scale of leagues, each of these leagues being equal, it would seem, to 3.814 English miles. Roughly speaking, then, we may say that the ostensible scale of the map is 1 in. = 60 miles. Now, if this were the actual scale of the plan of the river from Betor to the sea, the direct distance between Betor and Picholda would be 56 miles, and the direct distance between Picholda and Ságar would be 68 miles, whereas the true distances are 28 and 40 miles respectively. And again, if 1 in. = 60 miles were the actual scale, and if the 22nd degree of latitude be approximately correct, then the 23rd degree of latitude will pass south of Betor, which is really only three or four miles north of latitude $22^{\circ} 30'$. The preparer of the map has not shrunk from this last absurdity, and accordingly has marked latitude 23° at what is approximately latitude $22^{\circ} 30'$. From these three instances it is obvious that the true scale of the map of the river from Betor to the sea is 1 in. = 30 miles. This gives Betor the correct latitude $22^{\circ} 30' +$; makes the direct distance between Betor and Picholda exactly right, *viz.*, 28 miles; and makes the direct distance between Picholda and Ságar 34 miles, *i. e.*, 6 miles too little. This scale, however, will not do for the river above Betor, and in fact no hypothesis will help the plan here, or explain how Agarpára should be at least ten times nearer to Sátgáon than it is to Betor, or how Baránagar comes to be on the wrong side of the river. These mistakes seem to show that De Barros was not so well acquainted with the river above Betor, or, more probably, that the maker of the map was not sufficiently well informed to be able to properly piece together his materials.

I. (*Resumed*) I shall now return to my first point, and shall try to identify Pacuculij and Pisacoly. Blochmann* says :—

“ Pacuculij has hitherto defied all attempts at identification, and the same may be said of the places Pisaculy and Pisolta, marked by De Barros as lying in Hijili.† Van den Broucke throws a doubt on the correctness of these three names, inasmuch as he leaves out Pisaculy and Pisolta, and only gives Pacuculi, ‘on the authority of Portuguese maps.’ In position, but only faintly resembling in sound, Pisaculy corresponds to Mahishádal, the form given in the *Aín*; and Pacuculi corresponds in sound, and almost in position, with the old *parganá* PENCHÁKULÍ, or PENCHAKOLY, which lies just opposite to the present mouth of the Dámodar, and opposite to the ‘James and Mary Sands.’ *But we rather expect a place a little further down.*‡ I am, however, not satisfied with this identification, because PENCHÁKULÍ is after all the name of a *parganá*, and not of a place,§ at least at present, and I am rather inclined to avail myself of a conjecture proposed by Colonel Gastrell, and take the word to be a misprint for Pacucuti, with a *t* instead of an *l*,—which would clearly be a corruption of *pakká kuthí*, or ‘brick-house,’ and may refer to a pucca house, or ‘logie,’ built by the Portuguese at the entrance of the Húglí. Such houses, belonging to various human beings, are, or were, quite common on the banks of the Húglí; they served as depôts or retreats, and, when surrounded by a ditch, were even dignified with the name of ‘forts.’” A little before this Blochmann referring to the three mouths of the Dámodar, says that they “stand for the Saraswatí, the Dámodar, and the Rúpnráyan”; and further that “Pacaculi is placed opposite to the mouth of the river which we have identified with the Rúpnráyan.” From all this it appears that Blochmann’s *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* was the identification of the Rúpnráyan with one of the mouths of the Dámodar, and that this caused him to miss Pichuldoho and brought him into the greatest difficulties with regard to Pisacoly and Pacuculij. Sir Henry Yule’s correct identification of the Rúpnráyan with the Ganga has led at once to the discovery of Pichuldoho, and entirely does away with Blochmann’s arguments about Pisacoly and Pacuculij. Accordingly when Blochmann argues that we cannot identify Pacuculij with PENCHÁKULÍ

* *Geographical and Historical Notes on the Bardwán and Presidency Divisions*, at the end of Hunter’s *Statistical Account of the 24 Parganá*s, p. 384.

† This is a mistake. De Barros says that the Ganga enters the Ganges *between* Hijili and Picholda, consequently Picholda, or Pisolta, could not here been *in* Hijili.

‡ The italics are mine.

§ Blochmann seems to think that Pacuculij is the name of a place only, and not of a region; but De Barros distinctly says that it is the name of an island, *i. e.*, of a region.

opposite the mouth of the Dámodar, because “we rather expect a place a little further down,” I reply that the identification is unsatisfactory, because we expect a place a little further up. In fact if, as I think, the scale of the map is 1 in. = 30 miles, Pacuculij is 13 or 14 miles above Pichuldoho and must therefore be somewhere opposite Ulubáriá. Besides Penchákulí is undoubtedly the modern representative of Pisacoly; for (a) Penchákulí in 1760 was written Pichacooley*, and this, if ‘*ch*’ be pronounced soft, is the exact equivalent of Pisacoly; and again (b) Pisacoly is 5 or 6 miles above Pisolta, which is about the distance of Penchákulí from Pichuldoho. It is true that Pisacoly is on the west side of the river while Penchákulí is a fiscal division on the east side; but this does not avail against the general argument. Either, as is quite possible, Pisacoly, like Baránagar, has been misplaced, or, as is more probable, Pisacoly once extended to both sides of the river, the town being on the west side, and the disappearance of the town is due to a change in the course of the river Dámodar. Pacuculij must have stood somewhere near Royapore, where also stood Calcula in the 17th century, according to Sir Henry Yule; but unfortunately the names ‘Pacuculij’ and ‘Calcula’ seem to have altogether disappeared.

Having dealt as well as I can with the places along the side of the river from Betor to the sea, I must add a few words as to the meaning of the various tributary streams shown in the map. There can be no doubt about the two western tributaries. One is the Dámodar which enters the Ganges, (*i. e.*, the Húglí) by three mouths somewhere near Ulubáriá: in fact, if we reckon 1 in. = 30 miles, the middle mouth will be 16 miles above Pichuldoho is exactly at Ulubáriá. The other river, the Ganga, is meant for the Rúpnráyan. It has two mouths. The upper one is perhaps 5 or 6 miles below the present mouth of the Rúpnráyan, the lower one seems to correspond to the Haldí river. The two eastern tributaries are not so easily identified. The lower one is probably the Rogue’s River of which we read in the 17th and 18th centuries, and which is identified by Sir Henry Yule with the Kálpí Creek. The upper tributary joins the Húglí at a point north of Pacuculij, or Royapore, which seems to preclude us from identifying it with the river of Calcula. It may perhaps be the “Bangala river” which Sir Henry Yule considers to be the same as “the Loonghee Bungla Khall of modern charts, just below Jarmaker’s Reach.”

III. I now come to my third and last point: how far we may trust De Barros’ map as an accurate picture of the river at the beginning of the 16th century. This question has, of course, been partially answered by what has been already said, but it is as well to deal with it separately:

* Long’s *Selections from Unpublished Records*, p. 205.

I regard the map as fairly accurate for the course of the river from Betor to the sea. Mr. Blochmann doubted the very existence of Pacuculij, Pisacoly, and Pisolta; but I have found Pichuldoho in the very place indicated by De Barros and have also been able to account for Pacuculij and Pisacoly. Nor is there any reason to distrust the way in which the map arranges the tributary streams. Colonel Gastrell* has argued that the principal outfall of the Dámodar, even as late as 1745, was the Jan Perdo river, which he identifies with the Káná Dámodar, one mile north of Ulubáriá, but which Sir Henry Yule identifies with the present Ulubáriá Khál; and this conjecture is in complete harmony with De Barros' map, for it represents the Dámodar as entering the Ganges (Húglí) by 3 outfalls at a point somewhere about Ulubáriá. I am not quite so sure about the accuracy of the map as regards the outfall of the river Ganga or Rúpnaráyan. To-day the Húglí on meeting the Rúpnaráyan is deflected sharply to the east, and after describing a large semicircle returns once again to its former longitude and flows due south past Ságar. In De Barros' map there is no such semicircular deflection, the river empties itself directly into the sea. Instead of the tract of land which now extends between the mouths of the Rúpnaráyan and the Haldí and forms the police circle by Sutáhátá in the Tamluk subdivision, we have a small delta enclosed between the two arms of the Ganga. If this be accepted as a true picture of the state of things in the 16th century, we must suppose that the eastern portion of Tamluk (*i. e.*, the police circle of Sutáhátá) has been thrown up since then by the deposits of the Rúpnaráyan, and that hence has been formed the Diamond Harbour, the Diamond Sand being merely the last and least result of this very process.

Having thus reached the Diamond Sand, I am tempted to add one more remark, by way of conclusion, which has to do with the topography of the 17th and not the 16th century. Sir Henry Yule says that "the sand probably got its name from some ship," and notes that "a ship in the company's employ called the *Dyamond* is pretty often mentioned circa. 1620–1640." I have found some more definite evidence on this point. From a journal kept by Job Charnock and his Council, during the time when the English were quarrelling with the Nawab of Bengal, we learn that in 1688 Captain Herron's ship was called the Diamond. Under the date 14th November 1688 the diary notes:—"In the evening anchored at Sumbereroe trees†, where Captain Walthrop came on board of us to know when we intended to go over the Braces; which was resolved of,

* Hunter's *Statistical Account of Bengal*, Vol. III, pp. 258–261.

† Kitesal.

to be with the morning light: he informed us how, on the 12th current, at night, he left the ship *Diamond* ashore, with her head at Buffilo point,* but in little danger, being taken care for by Captain Heath, and supposeth she got off with the flood then coming in." After this Charnock and the Council set sail and reached Ballasore. And on the 18th "the ship *Recovery* arrived in the Road, from the Braces, bringing news of the ship *Diamond's* being in safety." I think it likely that the Diamond Sand got its name from this incident, the more so as, according to Sir H. Yule, Herron, the Captain of the *Diamond*, was the author not only of the earliest instructions printed in detail for the navigation of the river Húglí, "but probably also of the earliest chart of it that has any claim to quasi-scientific character."

Rajah Káns.—By H. BEVERIDGE, C. S.

The publication by our Society of the *Riyázussalátín* is a valuable contribution to the history of Bengal. It is to be hoped that it will lead to the discovery and publication of the sources of that work. For though Ghulam Husain's book was the foundation of Stewart's *History of Bengal*, he is too recent a writer for his statements to be of authority, except when he is quoting from a *risalah*, or little book, by some unknown author, or is giving the local traditions of Dinajpur and Maldah. It is a pity that so little is known about Ghulam Husain. He was a native of Zaidpur in Oudh, and was Dák Munshi under Mr. George Udny, the Commercial Resident at Maldah. He died there, and his tomb is still shown.

We owe to Ghulam Husain the fullest account that we possess of the Hindu whom he and other Muhammadan writers are supposed to designate by the name of *Rajah Káns*. I hope to show later on that his real name was Ganes, and that the early Muhamedan historians probably wrote his name as Gáns or Ganes. Ghulam Husain represents *Rajah Káns* as a cruel and bigoted tyrant. He describes him just as a worshipper of Krishna would describe *Rajah Kamśa* of Mathura, and no doubt allowance must be made in both cases for religious prejudices. But, cruel tyrant or not, *Rajah Káns* is the most interesting figure among the kings of Bengal. We feel that this obscure Hindu, who rose to supreme power in Bengal, and who for a time broke the bonds of Islam, must have been a man of vigour and capacity. He reminds us of the unfortunate Hemu who opposed Humáyun. Ghiassuddin, one of

* At the north edge of the Diamond Sand.